REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Independent claims 19, 21 and 22 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

Dependent claims 2, 5, 14-16, 20, 22, 24, 25 and 27 have been amended to remain consistent with amended independent claims 19, 21 and 22.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-9, 11-15, 17, 19-22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Terada et al. (U.S. 7,113,983). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 19 and 21 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites that a reproduction device includes a return position determining unit operable to determine, based on reproduction state change information, whether or not all of the stream media content has been reproduced by a reproducing unit. Further, claim 1 recites that, when the return position determining unit determines that all of the stream media content has been reproduced, the return position determining unit determines, as a first return position, a return position indicating a portion of the multimedia content to be displayed when transitioning from reproducing the stream media content back to displaying the

multimedia content when the reproduction of the stream media content has ended. Finally, claim 1 recites that, when the return position determining unit determines that all of the stream media content has not been reproduced, the return position determining unit determines, as a second return position, a return position that is different from the first return position. Terada fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing limitations required by amended independent claim 1.

Rather, Terada merely teaches "[i]n the reproducing sequence or order defined by the program file, the client receives or acquires the contents from the program service site and reproduces the received contents. For example, when an instruction to fast-forward or fast-rewind a specific content of a currently-reproduced program is given, the client acquires another content that precedes or follows the specific content in the reproducing sequence defined by the program file, in response to the instruction. This way, the client can reproduce the program while fast-forwarding or fast-rewinding a selected content or contents" (see col. 3, lines 59-67; and col. 8, lines 20-32). Accordingly, Terada teaches that the program reproduction system is capable of fast-forwarding and fast-rewinding audio/video at any time so as to obtain a desired program that is distributed, even when the viewer is reproducing the program (see col. 1, lines 66 and 67; and col. 2, lines 1 and 2).

Thus, in view of the above, although Terada teaches fast-forwarding and fast-rewinding the audio/video content while the viewer is reproducing the content, Terada still fails to disclose or suggest determining, based on reproduction state change information, whether or not all of the stream media content has been reproduced by the reproducing unit, such that, when the return position determining unit determines that all of the stream media content has been reproduced, the return position determining unit determines, as a first return position, a return position

indicating a portion of the multimedia content to be displayed when transitioning from reproducing the stream media content back to displaying the multimedia content when the reproduction of the stream media content has ended, and such that, when the return position determining unit determines that all of the stream media content has not been reproduced, the return position determining unit determines, as a second return position, a return position that is different from the first return position, as recited in claim 1.

In other words, even though Terada teaches streaming audio/video content that can be fast-forwarded and fast-rewound, Terada still fails to disclose or suggest that the reproduction state change information is taken into consideration and that whether all of the stream media content has been reproduced is taken into consideration, such that when all of the stream media content has been reproduced, a first return position is determined to be a return position indicating a portion of the multimedia content to be displayed when transitioning from reproducing the stream media content back to displaying the multimedia content when the reproduction of the stream media content has ended, and when all of the stream media content has not been reproduced, a second return position is determined to be a return position that is different from the first return position, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claims 2-17, 24, 25 and 27 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Terada.

Additionally, the Applicants note that a result of the structure required by claim 1 is that upon receiving an instruction for fast-forwarding or rewinding the content, the content reproduction device does not fast-forward or rewind the content, but can restrict the content that is to be obtained after the reproduction of the content that has been fast-forwarded or rewinded.

In light of the above, it is clear that Terada does not provide the above-mentioned result of the structure required by claim 1, because Terada fails to disclose or suggest that the reproduction state change information is taken into consideration and that whether all of the stream media content has been reproduced is taken into consideration, such that when all of the stream media content has been reproduced, a first return position is determined to be a return position indicating a portion of the multimedia content to be displayed when transitioning from reproducing the stream media content back to displaying the multimedia content when the reproduction of the stream media content has ended, and when all of the stream media content has not been reproduced, a second return position is determined to be a return position that is different from the first return position, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Terada or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Terada to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-17, 24, 25 and 27 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 19 and 21 are directed to a method and a program, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 19 and 21 and claims 20 and 22 that depend therefrom are allowable over the prior art of record.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 7, 10, 16, 25 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Terada, Official Notice, and Osawa et al. (U.S. 5,956,037). In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's Official Notice and Osawa do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from the Terada reference. Therefore, no obvious combination of Terada with the Examiner's Official Notice and Osawa would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and claims 2-17, 24, 25 and 27 that depend therefrom.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Akihiro TANAKA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/
2010.09.28 14:45:37 -04'00'

By _____
Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 28, 2010